



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/460,270	06/06/95	COLLINS R	065777027001

DAVID L. FEIGENBAUM
FISH AND RICHARDSON
225 FRANKLIN STREET
SUITE 3100
BOSTON MA 02110-2804

26M2/0630

RECEIVED

JOHNSON, T

EXAMINER

JUL 02 1997

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	13

RECEIVED

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
BOSTON, MA

DATE MAILED: 06/30/97

JUL 3 1997 *hja*

DAVID L. FEIGENBAUM

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

*SEE
Attached*

Docketed By Practice Systems	
Action Code:	_____
Base Date:	_____
Due Date:	_____
Deadline:	_____
Initials:	_____
Record:	_____

Docketed By Billing Secretary	
Due Date:	_____
Deadline:	_____
Initials:	_____

* No Docketing Required *	
Reviewed By Practice Systems	Initials: <i>hja</i>
Reviewed By Billing Secretary	Initials: _____

Applicant's
copy

Attachment for Interview Summary, paper #10, for case 08/468,290.

Discussed the proposed Draft amendment Faxed May 22, 1997, which contained a proposed amendment to claim 1, and is provided as an attachment. The amendment now explicitly recites "compressing" in the body of the claim. It was primarily discussed as to whether or not the new amended claim overcomes the prior art of record, i.e. Murata et al. and Leach. The references of Murata et al. and Leach were used as two different rejections to claim 1 under 103 in the first Office Action. It was argued that the main distinguishing feature of the claim is that each pointer associates "one of said regions with one of said textures", thus providing for compression. It was argued that Leach only explicitly uses pointers for the position of the regions, and that Murata et al. provide for manipulating vectors rather than bitmaps.

The examiner indicated that the limitation of generating pointers associating regions with textures is not sufficient to overcome the prior art of record, due to at least by the breadth of the claim. It was further indicated that lines 2-3 of the present claim are new considerations, and that any amendment to the limitation of generating pointers to bring out that only one pointer is used for an association would also be a new consideration. However, the Mr. Sobon felt that such a limitation would be too narrow in breadth.